

STATE AND TRIBAL WILDLIFE GRANTS

Appropriation Language

For wildlife conservation grants to States and to the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, the United States Virgin Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, American Samoa, and federally recognized Indian tribes under the provisions of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 and the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, for the development and implementation of programs for the benefit of wildlife and their habitat, including species that are not hunted or fished, [\$68,500,000] \$74,666,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and to remain available until expended: Provided, That of the amount provided herein, [\$6,000,000] \$5,940,000 is for a competitive grant program for Indian tribes, not subject to the remaining provisions of this appropriation: Provided further, That \$5,000,000 is for a competitive grant program for States, territories, and other jurisdictions with approved plans, not subject to the remaining provisions of this appropriation: Provided further, That the Secretary shall, after deducting said [\$6,000,000] \$10,940,000 and administrative expenses, apportion the amount provided herein in the following manner: (1) to the District of Columbia and to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, each a sum equal to not more than one-half of 1 percent thereof; and (2) to Guam, American Samoa, the United States Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, each a sum equal to not more than one-fourth of 1 percent thereof: Provided further, That the Secretary shall apportion the remaining amount in the following manner: (1) one-third of which is based on the ratio to which the land area of such State bears to the total land area of all such States; and (2) two-thirds of which is based on the ratio to which the population of such State bears to the total population of all such States: Provided further, That the amounts apportioned under this paragraph shall be adjusted equitably so that no State shall be apportioned a sum which is less than 1 percent of the amount available for apportionment under this paragraph for any fiscal year or more than 5 percent of such amount: Provided further, That the Federal share of planning grants shall not exceed 75 percent of the total costs of such projects and the Federal share of implementation grants shall not exceed 50 percent of the total costs of such projects: Provided further, That the non-Federal share of such projects may not be derived from Federal grant programs: [Provided further, That no State, territory, or other jurisdiction shall receive a grant unless it has developed, by October 1, 2005, a comprehensive wildlife conservation plan, consistent with criteria established by the Secretary of the Interior, that considers the broad range of the State, territory, or other jurisdiction's wildlife and associated habitats, with appropriate priority placed on those species with the greatest conservation need and taking into consideration the relative level of funding available for the conservation of those species:] Provided further, That no State, territory, or other jurisdiction shall receive a grant if its comprehensive wildlife conservation plan is disapproved and such funds that would have been distributed to such State, territory, or other jurisdiction shall be distributed equitably to States, territories, and other jurisdictions with approved plans: Provided further, That any amount apportioned in 2007 to any State, territory, or other jurisdiction that remains unobligated as of September 30, 2008, shall be reapportioned, together with funds appropriated in 2009, in the manner provided herein: [Provided further, That balances from amounts previously appropriated under the heading "State Wildlife Grants" shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation and shall remain available until expended.] (Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006.)

Justification of Language Change

- 1) Addition "...Provided further, That \$5,000,000 is for a competitive grant program for States, territories, and other jurisdictions with approved plans, not subject to the remaining provisions of this appropriation: "

A new competitive grant program is proposed in FY 2007.

- 2) Deletion "...Provided further, That no State, territory, or other jurisdiction shall receive a grant unless it has developed, by October 1, 2005, a comprehensive wildlife conservation plan, consistent with criteria established by the Secretary of the Interior, that considers the broad range of the State, territory, or other jurisdiction's wildlife and associated habitats, with appropriate priority placed on those species with the greatest conservation need and taking into consideration the relative level of funding available for the conservation of those species:]... "

Authority granted in FY 2004 to move unobligated balances from the FY 2001 competitive State Wildlife Grant program to the grant pool for formula grants provides this authority; therefore, the language is no longer needed.

Authorizing Statutes

Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531-1544). Prohibits the import, export, or taking of fish and wildlife and plants that are listed as threatened or endangered species; provides for adding species to and removing them from the list of threatened and endangered species, and for preparing and implementing plans for their recovery; provides for interagency cooperation to avoid take of listed species and for issuing permits for otherwise prohibited activities; provides for cooperation with States, including authorization of financial assistance; and implements the provisions of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna (CITES). Authorization of Appropriations: Expired September 30, 1992.

Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, as amended (16 U.S.C. 742(a)-754). Establishes a comprehensive national fish and wildlife policy and authorizes the Secretary to take steps required for the development, management, advancement, conservation, and protection of fisheries resources and wildlife resources through research, acquisition of refuge lands, development of existing facilities, and other means.

Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 661). The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to provide assistance to, and cooperate with, Federal, State, and public or private agencies and organizations in the development, protection, rearing, and stocking of all species of wildlife, resources thereof, and their habitat, in controlling losses of the same from disease or other causes, in minimizing damages from overabundant species, in providing public shooting and fishing areas, including easements across public lands for access thereto.

State and Tribal Wildlife Grants		FY 2005 Actual	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007			Change From 2006 (+/-)
				Fixed Costs & Related Changes (+/-)	Program Changes (+/-)	Budget Request	
State Wildlife Grants - Apportioned	\$(000)	61,040	59,556		+1,930	61,486	+1,930
Competitive Grants for States, Territories, and other Jurisdictions	\$(000)	0	0		+5,000	5,000	+5,000
Tribal Wildlife Grants	\$(000)	5,917	5,912		+28	5,940	+28
Administration	\$(000)	2,071	2,024		+216	2,240	+216
	FTE	7	7		0	7	0
User-Pay Cost Share		[138]	[205]			[206]	
Total, State & Tribal Wildlife Grants							
	\$(000)	69,028	67,492		+7,174	74,666	+7,174
	FTE	7	7		0	7	0

Summary of FY 2007 Program Changes for State and Tribal Wildlife Grants

Request Component	Amount	FTE
Program Changes		
• State Apportionments	+2,146	0
• State Competitive Grants	+5,000	0
• Tribal Grants	+28	0
TOTAL, Program Changes for the State and Tribal Wildlife Grant Program	+7,174	0

Justification of FY 2007 Program Changes

The FY 2007 budget request for State and Tribal Wildlife Grants is \$74,466,000 and 7 FTE, a net program increase of \$7,174,000 and 0 FTE from the 2006 enacted level.

State and Tribal Wildlife Grants (+\$2,194,000)

The proposed increase will provide additional grants to states and tribes. Grants funded with these additional funds will include projects covered under the Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Plans prepared by states and submitted to the Service. These plans will provide the roadmap for identifying the kinds of work that need to be undertaken in order to stabilize, restore, enhance, and protect species (Federally listed or state listed) and their habitats. The Service has received proposals from all states and territories. Currently, the Service has already approved many of the state submissions and is reviewing the remaining submissions.

State Competitive Grants (+\$5,000,000)

For FY 2007, \$5,000,000 of additional funding will be available through STWG, on top of \$61,486,020 apportioned through the formula distribution. The competitive portion of STWG will fund the highest ranking cooperative conservation projects that are in State Wildlife Conservation Plans. Priority will be given to exemplary cooperative conservation projects with an emphasis on performance and results. It is intended that this competitive component will be an incentive to integrate the principles of cooperation and performance into conservation projects.

Program Overview

The long-term goal of this program is to stabilize, restore, enhance and protect species and their habitat that are of concern. By doing so, the nation avoids the costly and time consuming process that occurs when a species' population plummets and needs additional management protection through the Endangered Species Act and other regulatory protections. The program attempts to accomplish this goal by 1) focusing projects on species and their habitats that are in most need of conservation and 2) by leveraging Federal funding through cost-sharing provisions with State and territorial fish and wildlife agencies. The program basis for the State and Tribal Wildlife Grant program is the Secretary's Four C's effort of communication, consultation, cooperation, and conservation.

Use of Cost and Performance Information

The State and Tribal Wildlife Grant Program has been using performance based information for several years in its resource allocation process.

- In FY 2005, the Service increased its technical assistance efforts to State wildlife agencies through Regional Development Assistance Teams. This action helped ensure that all States and territories completed and submitted their Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Plans by October 1, 2005. The States and territories achieved this goal. This increased collaboration also enabled the Service to readily and consistently answer State questions about the plans, and it helped the States and territories develop plans that met the strategic intent and detailed requirements of the Service and Congress.
- To encourage more rapid obligation of grant funds, the Service increased communications with program stakeholders regarding the financial status of their grant proposals and each State's status of obligating their apportionment within the 2-year deadline. The Service is accomplishing this through data sharing between Regional offices and State wildlife agencies.
- The Service is working to ensure that all individual program grant information is available to the stakeholder in order to increase the program accountability and increase the stakeholders' ability to provide final documents needed by the Service to obligate funds.
- The new competitive component of the program will emphasize performance results.
- The use of Activity Based Costing will provide the appropriate avenue to report our accomplishments and accurately document our efforts while further aiding our identification, prioritization, and utilization of our recognized expertise.

All 56 states and territories met the Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Plan submission deadline of October 1, 2005. As of January 23, 2006, the Service has reviewed 49 Comprehensive Wildlife Plans from the states and territories. Of these 49, 35 are approved and 14 are conditionally approved. None was disapproved. The Service is committed to assist any state whose Plan submission (yet to be reviewed) is rejected during the review process. For any disapproved Plan, the Service will work with the state to help ensure the state has an acceptable Plan in place for the FY 2007 state apportionment.

For the FY 2005 State Wildlife Grant cycle, the Service apportioned \$62 million to 56 states and territories. Of this apportionment, \$18 million was obligated as grants in their first year of the apportionment availability. For FY 2004, the Service apportioned \$61 million, and all but \$3,000 was obligated by the end of the second year, FY 2005.

To encourage more rapid obligation of grant funds, the Service increased its communication with program stakeholders regarding the financial status of their award proposals and each State's status of obligating their apportionment within the 2-year deadline. This is being accomplished by sharing data between Regional offices and State wildlife agencies.

2007 Program Performance Estimates

FY 2007 will be the first full year with approved State Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Plans in place. This will allow States and eligible territories to develop and propose project plans that fall within their Plans. In addition, for FY 2007, the Service is proposing additional funding of \$5,000,000 for a new competitive grant program (as part of the State and Tribal Wildlife Grant program) that will focus funds on projects that emphasize conservation performance that relies significantly on cooperation with other conservation programs and organizations. Following review and evaluation by the Service, the best proposals will go to the Secretary for approval and award.

The Service is working with the states to identify performance measures that will well represent the goals of the program that grant recipients can readily quantify and report to the Service.

2006 Planned Program Performance

In FY 2006, the Service, through the National Advisory Acceptance Team intends to review and determine acceptability of the State Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Plans. All 56 states and territories met the deadline of October 1, 2005, for submission of their Plans. This due date, contained in the STWG appropriations law, had to be met for a state or territory to be considered for apportionment of FY 2006 appropriated dollars. In addition, for a state or territory to received apportioned funds in FY 2006, its Plan must be approved or conditionally approved. In FY 2006, the Service and state Plan reviewers are meeting as the National Advisory Acceptance Team to recommend to the Service Director approval, conditional approval, or disapproval for each Plan. The Service is on track to make recommendations for all Plans by mid-February. As of January 23, 2006, 49 plans have been approved or conditionally approved; none has been disapproved.

States and territories will begin full implementation of their Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Plans in FY 2006 and continue in FY 2007. Some of the planned accomplishments include short grass prairie bird conservation in New Mexico, developing baseline status information of coastal alligator gar in Mississippi, and develop a Comprehensive Bay Scallop Restoration Plan on New York's Long Island to provide vital information for the rehabilitation of bay scallop resources in New York State. In addition, the Service is continuing work to establish measures and develop baseline data during FY 2006 and 2007. These measures will be targeted for states and territories to report their accomplishments in future years.

FY 2006 is the first year in which the state Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Plans are in effect. Approved Plans will provide clear direction for the states on how to proceed as well as assist the Service in its ability to coordinate conservation activities and funding.

In FY 2006, \$59,555,709 was apportioned to the states. They have up to two years in which to obligate these funds. Examples of state projects include:

New Mexico: Short Grass Prairie Bird Conservation

To take proactive measures to conserve wildlife and vital natural areas for future generations, New Mexico conservation managers need solid information. The Rocky Mountain Bird Observatory and the New Mexico Game and Fish Department are using State Wildlife Grants to get the most thorough information possible. This project will initiate an inventory and monitoring system for grassland birds in northeastern New Mexico as part of a regional

monitoring effort. Information from the study will be used to develop a comprehensive conservation plan for short-grass prairie birds. Having complete knowledge of where various species of birds are living in the State will enable cost-effective conservation decisions.

Mississippi's Alligator Gar

The alligator gar, a large fish that grows up to thirteen feet and weighs hundreds of pounds, was once abundant in southern Mississippi. Over the last century, their population has dwindled, making the alligator gar extremely rare in the Mississippi Delta and possibly along the Gulf Coast. State Wildlife Grants are now helping to provide baseline status information of coastal alligator gar. Such information is essential to make management decisions. By gathering this information now, proactive conservation measures can be put in place to conserve the alligator gar for future generations.

New York: Comprehensive Bay Scallop Restoration Plan

Historically, bay scallops represent an important shellfish resource in Peconic and Gardiner's bays in eastern Long Island. Bay scallops have experienced a 99 percent decline since 1985 due to an unusual algal bloom, "brown tide." Brown tide kills the eel grass in which mussels live, and discourages recreational fishing, boating, and swimming. This project will develop a Comprehensive Bay Scallop Restoration Plan and evaluate a pilot bay scallop spawning sanctuary. Results will provide vital information for the rehabilitation of bay scallop resources in New York State and may lead to a greater understanding of "brown tide," which will benefit both wildlife and people.

2005 Program Performance Accomplishments

The Service received a copy of state proposed Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Plans from all states. Many were reviewed and approved, while others continue to be reviewed and have been tentatively approved. With this one significant step completed, the states will have a mechanism to plan their conservation activities in the future as well as a plan that should facilitate grant requests in the future.

In FY 2005, \$62,088,604 of grants was apportioned to the states. They have up to two years to obligate these funds. Several examples of projects include:

Montana: Arctic Grayling Restoration

The arctic grayling in the upper Big Hole River in Montana are the last river-dwelling grayling population in the lower 48 States. Efforts to restore this beautiful fish to the Beaverhead, Ruby, Sun, and Missouri rivers are now under way with the help of State Wildlife Grants. Working with local landowners and conservation groups, the Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks Department has been rearing and stocking grayling into the deep cold pools of Montana's rivers. This will help conserve the grayling before they become rarer and more costly to protect.

Attracting Waterbirds to North Carolina's Coast

The North Carolina shoreline has historically been home to black skimmers, common terns, and gull-billed terns, but unfortunately, these species have become rarer in recent years as their nesting areas have been lost. State Wildlife Grants have helped efforts to conserve the birds by funding a highly successful project to provide safe nesting sites. Using decoys and recorded birdcalls to attract terns and skimmers, the 2005 nesting season saw the hatch of hundreds of chicks. Biologists are highly encouraged by this success and believe efforts such as this will help stem declines and ultimately protect populations of other types of water birds for future generations.

State Wildlife Grants Apportionments Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number 15.634			
State	Fiscal Year 2004	Fiscal Year 2005	Fiscal Year 2006
Alabama	\$950,854	\$964,630	925,278
Alaska	\$3,060,095	\$3,104,430	2,977,785
American Samoa	\$153,004	\$155,221	148,889
Arizona	\$1,449,489	\$1,470,489	1,410,501
Arkansas	\$714,925	\$725,283	695,695
California	\$3,060,095	\$3,104,430	2,977,785
Colorado	\$1,270,452	\$1,288,858	1,236,279
Connecticut	\$612,020	\$620,887	595,558
Delaware	\$612,020	\$620,887	595,558
District of Columbia	\$306,009	\$310,443	297,778
Florida	\$2,592,298	\$2,629,854	2,522,570
Georgia	\$1,515,288	\$1,537,242	1,474,530
Guam	\$153,004	\$155,221	148,889
Hawaii	\$612,020	\$620,887	595,558
Idaho	\$721,085	\$731,532	701,689
Illinois	\$2,084,443	\$2,114,642	2,028,375
Indiana	\$1,076,313	\$1,091,906	1,047,362
Iowa	\$769,994	\$781,149	749,282
Kansas	\$905,720	\$918,842	881,358
Kentucky	\$821,523	\$833,425	799,425
Louisiana	\$928,044	\$941,490	903,082
Maine	\$612,020	\$620,887	595,558
Maryland	\$800,932	\$812,536	779,389
Massachusetts	\$932,424	\$945,933	907,344
Michigan	\$1,754,509	\$1,779,928	1,707,316
Minnesota	\$1,228,258	\$1,246,052	1,195,220
Mississippi	\$703,052	\$713,238	684,141
Missouri	\$1,226,536	\$1,244,305	1,193,544
Montana	\$1,078,493	\$1,094,118	1,049,484
N. Mariana Islands	\$153,004	\$155,221	148,889
Nebraska	\$738,529	\$749,229	718,664
Nevada	\$993,612	\$1,008,008	966,886
New Hampshire	\$612,020	\$620,887	595,558
New Jersey	\$1,215,376	\$1,232,984	1,182,685
New Mexico	\$1,040,333	\$1,055,405	1,012,350
New York	\$2,945,190	\$2,987,859	2,865,970
North Carolina	\$1,455,766	\$1,476,857	1,416,609
North Dakota	\$612,020	\$620,887	595,558
Ohio	\$1,839,503	\$1,866,153	1,790,024
Oklahoma	\$930,946	\$944,434	905,906
Oregon	\$1,102,960	\$1,118,939	1,073,292
Pennsylvania	\$1,993,755	\$2,022,640	1,940,127
Puerto Rico	\$306,009	\$310,443	297,778
Rhode Island	\$612,020	\$620,887	595,558
South Carolina	\$757,142	\$768,112	736,777
South Dakota	\$612,020	\$620,887	595,558
Tennessee	\$1,060,816	\$1,076,184	1,032,282
Texas	\$3,060,095	\$3,104,430	2,977,785
Utah	\$859,703	\$872,158	836,578
Vermont	\$612,020	\$620,887	595,558
Virgin Islands	\$153,004	\$155,221	148,889
Virginia	\$1,243,105	\$1,261,115	1,209,668
Washington	\$1,257,489	\$1,275,707	1,223,665
West Virginia	\$612,020	\$620,887	595,558
Wisconsin	\$1,106,520	\$1,122,551	1,076,757
Wyoming	\$612,020	\$620,887	595,558
Total	\$61,201,916*	\$62,088,604	\$59,555,709

* \$64,642 of reverted funds added to the apportionment.

Standard Form 300

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
STATE and TRIBAL WILDLIFE GRANTS FUND**

Program and Financing (in thousands of dollars)			
Identification code 14-1694-0	2005 Actual	2006 Estimate	2007 Estimate
Obligations by program activity:			
00.01 State Wildlife Formula Grants	73,700	74,000	73,000
00.02 State Wildlife Competitive Grants	0	0	2,000
00.03 Administration	2,401	2,473	2,559
00.04 Tribal Wildlife Grants	7,582	8,000	8,600
10.00 Total obligations	83,683	84,473	86,159
Budgetary resources available for obligation:			
21.40 Unobligated balance available, start of year	63,243	55,556	38,575
21.10 Recoveries	6,968		
22.00 New Budget authority (gross)	69,028	67,492	74,666
23.90 Total budgetary resources available for obligation	139,239	123,048	113,241
23.95 New obligations (-)	-83,683	-84,473	-86,159
24.40 Unobligated balance available, end of year	55,556	38,575	27,082
New budget authority (gross), detail:			
Discretionary			
40.20 Appropriation (Special Fund) LWCF	70,000	68,500	74,666
40.36 Rescission of Authority [P.L. 108-447]	-972		
40.36 Rescission of Authority [P.L. 109-54]		-326	
40.36 Rescission of Authority [P.L. 109-148]		-682	
43.00 Appropriation (total discretionary)	69,028	67,492	74,666
Change in unpaid obligations:			
Unpaid obligations, start of year:			
72.40 Obligated balance, start of year	123,067	138,302	158,775
73.10 New obligations	83,683	84,473	86,159
73.20 Total outlays, gross (-)	-61,480	-64,000	-73,000
73.45 Recoveries	-6,968		
Unpaid obligations, end of year:			
74.40 Obligated balance, end of year	138,302	158,775	171,934
86.97 Outlays from new discretionary authority	21,000	20,000	23,000
86.98 Outlays from discretionary balances	40,480	44,000	50,000
87.00 Total outlays (gross)	61,480	64,000	73,000
89.00 Budget authority	69,028	67,492	74,666
90.00 Outlays	61,480	64,000	73,000

Object classification (in thousands of dollars)			
Direct obligations:			
11.1 Full-time permanent	1,227	1,276	1,327
11.3 Other than full time permanent	14	15	15
11.5 Other personnel compensation	97	101	105
11.9 Total personnel compensation	1,338	1,392	1,447
12.1 Civilian Benefits	392	408	424
13.0 Unemployment Benefit Payments	10	10	11
21.0 Travel and transportation of persons	173	176	180
22.0 Transportation of Things	28	29	29
23.1 Rent Payments to GSA	125	128	130
23.3 Communications	16	16	17
24.0 Printing and reproduction			
25.2 Other services	137	140	143
25.3 Purchases of goods and services from Government Accts.	123	125	128
25.7 Operations and Maintenance of Equipment	2	2	2
26.0 Supplies	13	13	14
31.0 Equipment	44	45	46
41.0 Grants, subsidies and contributions	81,282	81,989	83,589
99.9 Total obligations	83,683	84,473	86,159
Personnel Summary			
Direct:			
Total compensable work years:			
1001 Full-time equivalent employment	15	8	8

This Page Intentionally Left Blank